REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 23, 2003, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by July 23, 2003.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,408,604 to Van de Lavoir et al. Claims 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Lavoir et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,359,531 to Iwamoto et al. Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Looking first at the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under Section 112, the Applicant is unclear as to the stated grounds for rejection relating to the lack of antecedent basis for "calculation". The "calculation of a plurality of bit maps..." is the first in the series of three steps defined in claim 1. However, in order to more clearly define the three steps, "calculation of", "storage of", and "execution of" have been changed to "calculating", "storing", and "executing", respectively.

With regard to the substantive rejection of the claims, claim 1 has been amended to define that the object is moving along the path curve during the processing of the display sequence and the displaying of correspondingly memorized bit maps. This feature is disclosed in the specification on page 7, line 5 and following.

The Van de Lavoir reference describes a process control computer system and a method for graphically displaying the flow of process control information (column 1, lines 2-10). The process flow is displayed using graphical icons. The graphical icons are composed to display the process flow, which is shown in Fig. 8. Furthermore, a counter may be displayed, which is shown in Figs. 13a and 13b. This counter may change during the displaying of the process flow (column 21, line 31 to column 22, line 4).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has equated the process flow line of Van de Lavoir to the path curve of the present invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and indeed, submits that this is one of the most important distinctions between Van de Lavoir and the present invention.

In Van de Lavoir, the displayed icons of the process flow are fixed in their positions of the process. Even if one icon may change its color at its fixed position, for example, the counter in Fig. 13, it is not possible for one process icon to move to another position in the process line during displaying a production process. Thus, amended claim 1 defines a patentably distinct set of features neither shown nor suggested by Van de Lavoir.

Even if the icons (for example, in Figs. 13a and 13b) may change at their positions in their form and/or in their color in Van de Lavoir, there is no suggestion in this reference than an object representation is moving along the process flow during displaying the process. Even if the icons may be moved during the construction of the process flow, they cannot flow along the process

line because there is no process line available at that moment: the process line is built after the icons are positioned on the display screen.

In addition, in the present invention, the same object is processed and displayed. In the Van de Lavoir patent, different icons represent different steps in the process flow. In the present invention, the object – here, the pointer – is moving and all of the object representations are object representations of this one object.

In this amendment, the Applicant has added new dependent claim 12, which defines this limitation: that the objection representation are object representations of the same object.

In addition, a further new dependent claim 13 has been added, which defines that the object is a pointer and that the pointer is moving along the scale and in different positions of the pointer, graphical representations are calculated and stored in advance.

With regard to the rejections of the dependent claims, claim 5 resolves the problem that it is not possible to calculate and store an object calculation for all of the positions that the object can reach on the path curve. Thus, claim 5 defines that for these positions, an interpolation is calculated between two calculated positions. Van de Lavoir provides no suggestion that such a calculation between two stored graphics is performed. In column 37, line 23 and on, Van de Lavoir shows some procedures, which define processes for drawing the process flow line. However, there is no suggestion to perform an interpolation between two stored images of an object that is moving on a path curve.

Claim 6 defines that the interpolation of claim 5 is done for every one of the fundamental colors, red, green, and blue separately. In this way, the calculation of the interpolation is simplified. There is no suggestion of such a simplified interpolation in the Van de Lavoir patent.

With regard to claims 9 and 11, the Applicant respectfully submits that the features defined in these claims are not inherent in the Van de Lavoir patent, because this reference describes a global process control information system and method. Such a system is not used in motor vehicles. Therefore, claims 9 and 11 are not obvious over the Van de Lavoir patent.

Claim 7 of the present application defines a pixel interpolation. Neither Van de Lavoir nor Iwamoto discloses or suggests such a process. Only an average value of process data is calculated. Iwamoto provides no teaching or suggestion that pixel data of a graphical representation is interpolated in any way.

Finally, with regard to claim 10 of the present application, Iwamoto provides no teaching or suggestion that the object of a graphical representation is a speedometer pointer. At column 4, lines 15-61, the table shown in Fig. 4 of Iwamoto is discussed. Fig. 4 shows a setting screen for calibration data. There is no suggestion of a pointer of a speedometer pointer in the graphical representation of the Iwamoto patent.

For the reasons set forth above, then, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11, as well as new claims 12 and 13, are patentable over the art of

record. The Applicant further requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

It is noted that on October 13, 2000, simultaneously with the filing of this application, Applicant also filed an Information Disclosure Statement, of which a copy is attached. This Information Disclosure Statement was filed with respect to the prior art cited in the International Search Report which in any event is considered by the Examiner. The purpose in filing an Information Disclosure Statement with respect thereto is to assure that the prior art mentioned therein will be printed as prior art on the face of any eventual patent. Accordingly, it is requested that this Information Disclosure Statement be considered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

In light of the foregoing arguments in support of patentability, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700